6028

A PLURALITY OF PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD PROVED; AND THE BIBLE-TRANSLATION OF THREE IMPORTANT PASSAGES IN ZECHARIAH VINDICATED.

A

SERMON,

PREACHED BEFORE THE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,

On SUNDAY, Nov. 27, 1796.

THE SECOND EDITION.

TO WHICH IS ADDED,

AN ANSWER TO THE OBSERVATIONS CONTAINED IN DR. BLAYNEY'S APPENDIX TO HIS NEW TRANSLATION OF ZECHARIAH.

BY

JOHN EVELEIGH, D.D.

PROVOST OF ORIEL COLLEGE, AND PREBENDARY OF ROCHESTER.

OXFORD:

SOLD BY J. COOKE;

By F. and C. RIVINGTON, London; and by

W. H. LUNN, Cambridge.

M.DCC.XCVII.

IMPRIMATUR,

SCROPE BERDMORE,

COLL. MERT.
Mart. 23, 1797.

VICE-CAN. OXON.

SERMON.

ZECH. ii. 8—11.

For thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts; After the glory hath he ſent me unto the nations which ſpoiled you: for he that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye.

For behold I will ſhake mine hand upon them, and they ſhall be a ſpoil to their ſervants: and ye ſhall know that the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me.

Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midſt of thee, ſaith the Lord.

And many nations ſhall be joined to the Lord in that day, and ſhall be my people: and I will dwell in the midſt of thee, and thou ſhalt know that the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me unto thee.

THERE is no part of holy Scripture that more fully vindicates thoſe confeſſions of our faith, which call upon us to acknowledge a plurality of perſons in the Godhead, than the very remarkable paſſage of Zechariah which I have now read to you. Nor ought any believer in the New Teſtament

to be ſurpriſed at the declarations contained in it, or to be deterred in the leaſt from receiving them in their obvious and literal ſenſe.

A paſſage, which, like the text, declares, "that the Lord of Hoſts was ſent by one "who alſo himſelf is the Lord of Hoſts," ought not for a moment to excite aſtoniſhment in a Chriſtian; knowing as he muſt, that the ſecond Perſon in the Trinity, who is ſo often ſaid "to have been ſent by the "Father," is not only called in the New Teſtament [a] "God," but alſo by a name which is allowed to be equivalent to "the Lord of "Hoſts," namely, "[b] the Almighty."

It might indeed ſtagger the faith of thoſe who had no opportunity of being inſtructed by ſuch additional information on the ſubject. We muſt not therefore wonder, that the Chaldee [c] Paraphraſt interprets the paſſage as if the Prophet himſelf was the perſon ſent.

This interpretation has been adopted, probably without much conſideration, by a

[a] John i. 1. Rom. ix. 5, &c.
[b] Rev. i. 8.
[c] The Chaldee Paraphraſt concludes his interpretation of the text with inſerting לאתנבאה, "to propheſy," ſo as to render the laſt words "hath ſent me to propheſy to thee."

learned

[d] learned writer, whoſe comment, in connection with that of [e] another learned member of our Church, extends to the whole of the Old Teſtament, and is in common uſe among us. I ſay, probably without much conſideration, becauſe in ſo doing he contradicts himſelf. For, in the [f] parallel paſſage of Iſaiah, he confidently aſſerts, that Chriſt, and not the Prophet, is the perſon ſent, in oppoſition to the Chaldee Paraphraſt; and [g] refers, in confirmation of his comment on that paſſage, to this very text in Zechariah, which he notwithſtanding explains afterwards in ſo different a ſenſe.

In conſequence however of ſuch degrading interpretations, the text appears lately to have been overlooked or diſregarded. The generality of readers appear to have acquieſced in a confuſed kind of perſuaſion that the Prophet is the Perſon ſent: and not a ſingle obſervation with regard to this Perſon has been

[d] Lowth.
[e] Patrick.
[f] Iſ. xlviii. 16.
[g] Though Lowth refers to verſes 10 and 11 only of the text; yet in his comment on thoſe verſes he explains "who was the "perſon ſent," by referring to the preceding verſe; ſo that his reference from Iſ. xlviii. 16. may be conſidered as made to the whole text.

made by the learned [h] author of the New Tranſlation of the Minor Prophets.

But whatever deference may thus have lately been ſhewn to the Chaldee Paraphraſt, no ſuch attention was paid to his interpretation of the paſſage before us by learned writers of the Chriſtian Church in former ages.

Jerome and Theodoret, in their reſpective comments, explicitly and excluſively conſider the Lord of Hoſts, mentioned in the beginning of the text, as the Perſon ſent. Their words are ſo full and pointed, as to deſerve the moſt particular attention. On the firſt verſe of the text Jerome remarks, "Vox Sal-"vatoris loquentis inducitur, qui omnipotens "Deus a Patre omnipotente miſſum ſe eſſe "dicit." And again, in [i] another part of his works, he cites the two laſt verſes, and thus explains them, "Hæc dicit Dominus miſſus "a Domino cui nomen Omnipotens."—The comment of Theodoret alſo is not leſs deciſive, [k] "Ὑπεδειξε τοινυν (ſays Theodoret) ἡμιν "ὁ προ-

[h] Dr. Newcome, now Primate of Ireland.

[i] See Works, vol. iv. p. 132. edit. Par. 1624.

[k] "The Prophet, therefore," (ſays Theodoret) "has given "us to underſtand not only that there are two Perſons, but "alſo two Perſons of the ſame rank: *For thus ſaith the Lord of "Hoſts, after the glory hath he ſent me*; and, to ſhew who the "Perſon

" ὁ προφητης ε μονον την δυαδα των προσωπων,
" αλλα και το ὁμοτιμον των προσωπων· ταδε γαρ
" λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, οπισω δοξης απεσαλ-
" κε με. Και δεικνυς τις ὁ αποσειλας επαγει· και
" γνωσεσθε ὁτι κυριος παντοκρατωρ απεσαλκε με.
" Τοιγαρεν και ὁ αποσειλας κυριος παντοκρατωρ,
" και ὁ αποσαλεις κυριος παντοκρατωρ, και ισεμια
" αξιωματων διαφορα."

I might produce citations alſo to the ſame effect from the learned comment of Cyril, Biſhop of Alexandria.

Nor are Commentators the only writers of thoſe early ages, from whom ſuch citations may be produced. Athanaſius himſelf ſays expreſsly, in his treatiſe " On the Trinity and " the Holy Spirit," which is ſtill extant in the Latin tranſlation, [l] " Omnipotens autem " Filius Dei de quo Zecharias ait: *Propterea* " *ſic dicit Dominus Omnipotens poſt gloriam* " *miſit me.*" St. Auguſtine alſo, having ſpoken of the parallel paſſage in Iſaiah, [m] ſays, " Eſt " et alius locus apud Zechariam, qui hoc

" Perſon ſending is, he ſubjoins, *And ye ſhall know that the* " *Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me:* therefore both the perſon ſend- " ing is Lord of Hoſts, and the Perſon ſent is Lord of Hoſts, " and there is no difference of dignity between them."

[l] See Athanaſius's Works, vol. ii. p. 978. edit. Par. 1698.

[m] De Civitate Dei, lib. xx. c. 30.

" evidenter oſtendit, quod Omnipotentem mi-
" ſit Omnipotens. Quis quem, niſi Deus Pa-
" ter Deum Filium? Nam ita ſcriptum eſt:
" *Hæc enim dicit Dominus Omnipotens, poſt*
" *gloriam miſit me.*"

To theſe diſtinguiſhed writers of the early ages may be added Vatablus, Caſtalio, Druſius, and [m] other eminent critics in later times, who are unanimous in declaring, that the perſon who was ſent is not the Prophet, but the Meſſiah. Indeed we find it expreſsly declared by them, that the Lord of Hoſts and Perſon ſent in the beginning of the paſſage is Chriſt; and that the ſame appellation, when repeated at the concluſion, points out the Father as the Perſon ſending.

Upon the concurrent ſupport of theſe, and (as I might add) of all the diſtinguiſhed [n] Theologians of antiquity, whoſe opinion on the ſubject can at preſent be aſcertained, I might with confidence reſt the explanation of the

[m] No one of thoſe whoſe expoſitions of Scripture are collected in the "Critici Sacri" appears to entertain a ſuſpicion that the Prophet is the perſon ſent.

Even Grotius ſuppoſes, that the perſon who was ſent is not the Prophet, but Michael. Menochius, who lived nearly at the ſame time with Grotius, calls him Gabriel.

[n] Rabbi David Kimchi himſelf refers to the Meſſiah, Zech. ii. 10, 11. See Allix's Judgment of the Jewiſh Church againſt the Unitarians, p. 37. Lond. 1699.

text:

text: eſpecially too, as, in the very middle and moſt exalted part of it, Jehovah ſays, with manifeſt reference to his being ſent, "Lo! "I come:" "Sing and rejoice, O daugh- "ter of Zion: for lo! I come, and I will "dwell in the midſt of thee, ſaith Jehovah. "And many nations ſhall be joined to Jeho- "vah in that day, and ſhall be my people:" and then, as if to preclude all poſſible doubt that the Perſon ſent is Jehovah who ſays to the daughter of Zion, "Lo! I come," the ſpeaker not only repeats, what was connected with it, "and I will dwell in the midſt of thee," but changing the number concludes, "and "thou," not "ye," (as it ſtands in the ninth verſe) that is, "thou daughter of Zion, ſhalt "know that the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me "unto thee."

But I mean not to reſt my explanation of the text upon human authority ſolely; neither ſhall I dwell upon the very powerful ſupport that I might derive from the parallel paſſage in the 48th chapter of Iſaiah, and which not only the learned commentator above contraſted with himſelf, but alſo his immediate ° deſcendant and great ſucceſſor in the illuſtration of Iſaiah refers expreſsly to Chriſt. For this

° Biſhop Lowth.

paſſage, as well as the text, has been otherwiſe interpreted by the Chaldee Paraphraſt. I ſhall therefore not dwell upon it; but endeavour,—after an obſervation or two upon the language uſed by the ſpeaker in the text,—to confirm and enforce the explanation here given of it by three ſimilar paſſages in the Prophecy of Zechariah; which are all totally miſinterpreted in the new tranſlation of the Minor Prophets, and which muſt be vindicated, as they ſtand in our Engliſh Bible, before it can be expected that their authority and application to our ſubject ſhould be fully admitted.—Afterwards I ſhall conclude with a few obſervations upon the whole.

To eſtabliſh a doctrine of ſo great importance as that which is deduced from the text, it is exceedingly deſirable, in the firſt place, that the language of the paſſage ſhould be clear and determinate. And what language can be more ſo, as far as relates to the perſon of the ſpeaker, than thoſe remarkable words, with which the text begins? "For thus ſaith "the Lord of Hoſts; After the [p] Glory hath "he

[p] In ſpeaking of the language of the text, it might be urged, that verſe the 8th, with which the text commences, is connected with the preceding part of the chapter by the illative particle

" he ſent me." Whom can theſe words permit us to underſtand by " me," except the Lord of Hoſts? The ſubſequent language alſo correſponds with this and no other interpretation: " I will ſhake mine hand upon " them," ſays the ſpeaker, " and they ſhall " be a ſpoil to their ſervants." Could this be the Prophet's hand?—It is the hand of Jehovah himſelf, and of the Lord of Hoſts himſelf, which is ſaid, in one paſſage of Iſaiah, to be ſhaken [q] over the river; and, in another, over [r] Egypt: and no where elſe (except in the text) is the [s] ſame form of expreſſion uſed

ticle " for;" that the word " Glory," mentioned in this verſe, refers to the ſame word in verſe the 5th; and that after Jehovah has declared, in the 5th verſe, " he will be glory in the midſt " of Jeruſalem," the ſame divine Perſon proceeds in the 8th verſe to declare, " For thus ſaith the Lord of Hoſts, After the " Glory hath he ſent me:" and from thence it might immediately be inferred, that the Perſon ſent was the ſame Jehovah, who, it was before ſaid, ſhould be Glory in the midſt of Jeruſalem. But though ſuch a conſtruction of the paſſage, as far as relates to the word " Glory," is not without advocates of very great name; yet as this explanation, no leſs than every other which has been given of the word, is attended with difficulties, I wiſh to leave its meaning undecided, and to draw no other argument from the text itſelf, than what reſults from the obvious conſtruction of the other parts of it.

[q] Iſaiah xi. 15.

[r] Ibid. xix. 16.

[s] " Upon" and " over" are both expreſſed in the Hebrew by the prepoſition עַל, which, properly and agreeably to its derivation, denotes " above."

in

in holy Writ.—And again the text proceeds, "Lo! I come, and I will dwell in the midſt "of thee, ſaith Jehovah. And many nations "ſhall be joined to Jehovah in that day, and "ſhall be my people; and I will dwell in the "midſt of thee, and thou ſhalt know that "the Lord of Hoſts hath ſent me unto thee." Can any part of this be ſeparated from the reſt, and referred to the Prophet? Or can there be a doubt, from the conſtruction and connection of the whole text, that the ſame Perſon both ſpeaks throughout, and ſays, in the concluſion, that he was ſent: eſpecially alſo, when (as I have before inſiſted) in the very middle and moſt exalted part of the paſſage Jehovah ſays expreſsly, and with reference to his being ſent, "Lo! I come."

But indeed, to demonſtrate the obvious meaning of the whole, if, conſiſtently with the exalted language, any created being could be ſubſtituted, and that part aſſigned him in the text, which is now confeſſedly ſuſtained by the Lord of Hoſts and Jehovah, it may be aſſerted, without danger of contradiction, that there would not in that caſe be a ſurmiſe of doubt, but this ſame [t] individual Being was the

[t] In the 10th and 11th verſes the ſpeaker is called Jehovah, and

the ſpeaker from the beginning to the end of the text, and alſo the Perſon ſent.

Not to dwell longer therefore upon a ſubject, which is ſo incontrovertible as the literal meaning of the text, I ſhall endeavour to ſupercede the neceſſity of looking out for any figure or irregular change of Perſon in it, by proceeding to confirm the literal conſtruction by other paſſages in the writings of the ſame Prophet.

The paſſages, which I am to uſe for this purpoſe, and which I am alſo to vindicate as they ſtand tranſlated in our Bible, are three in number.—The firſt is found in the beginning of the third chapter, or, as it may be ſtated, in the part of Zechariah which almoſt immediately follows the text. Here we have a paſſage, which aſſerts in reality the very doctrine for which I am contending, namely, that a Perſon, called by a name peculiar to

and is ſaid to be ſent by the Lord of Hoſts. Doubtleſs I need not obſerve on this occaſion, that Jehovah is the ſame with the Lord (or Jehovah) of Hoſts, who before was the ſpeaker, and was ſaid to be ſent.——It may, however, be added, as a circumſtance worthy of obſervation, that, as in the two former verſes, the Lord of Hoſts, who was ſent, ſpeaks of another Lord of Hoſts that ſent him; ſo, in the two latter, Jehovah, who ſays, "Lo! I come," ſpeaks of another Jehovah, ſaying that "many "nations ſhall be joined to Jehovah in that day, and ſhall be "my people."

the

the ſupreme God, is ſent by another of the ſame name.

To prove this, I need only inſiſt upon a circumſtance, which no one will deny; that, by the *angel* of the Lord, or of Jehovah, is meant a perſon *ſent* by the Lord or by Jehovah; and proceed to the paſſage itſelf, which is thus tranſlated in our Engliſh Bible—"And "he ſhewed me Joſhua the high prieſt, ſtand- "ing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan "ſtanding at his right hand to reſiſt him. "And the Lord ſaid unto Satan, the Lord "rebuke thee, O Satan."—Now that the Lord or Jehovah, who ſpake unto Satan, was a different perſon from him who was called upon to rebuke Satan, is evident. He was unqueſtionably the angel of Jehovah before whom Joſhua was ſtanding. Conſequently the angel of Jehovah, or one who was ſent by Jehovah, is himſelf called Jehovah. No paſſage can be more clear in its meaning; and none can more ſatisfactorily confirm the great doctrine which is contained in the text. For the confirmation is in ſome meaſure incidental, and therefore the more convincing.

That Jehovah who ſpake unto Satan was the angel of Jehovah, mentioned in the preceding verſe, muſt have appeared indiſputable

able to the author of the new tranſlation; ſince his miſinterpretation of the paſſage ariſes from a wiſh to call both by the ſame name, which he accordingly does by inſerting in brackets "the angel of" before "Jehovah;" though ſuch an alteration of the paſſage muſt cut up by the roots the powerful argument, which Chriſtians from the [u] beginning have drawn from hence in proof of a plurality of Perſons in the Godhead. Admit for a moment that the alteration ought to be made, and our argument is annihilated: the angel of Jehovah, mentioned in the firſt verſe, is merely called the angel of Jehovah in the ſecond; and not, as we contend, Jehovah himſelf.—Doubtleſs nothing more can be neceſſary to evince a want of proper foundation for this alteration, than ſimply to ſtate, that it is made in direct oppoſition, not only to our Bible-Verſion, but alſo to every other Verſion except the Syriac, and to every Manuſcript extant.

In confirmation alſo of the application of the term Lord of Hoſts, in the text, both to

[u] Jerome and Athanaſius take particular notice of this paſſage, and apply it in vindication of our Lord's divinity. See Jerome's Comment in locum, and Athanaſius de Trinitate et Spiritu Sancto. Works, vol. ii. p. 970.

the

the Perſon ſending and him who was ſent, we find that the Lord of Hoſts, in the 13th chapter of Zechariah, foretelling the ſufferings of the Redeemer, ſpeaks of him as equal to himſelf; he bids the ſword awake againſt his ſhepherd, againſt the man that is his "Fellow," or, as that term means in our tranſlation, his "Equal." The original word is עמיתי, and, excluſively of this paſſage, it is found in the Book of Leviticus only. There it is often uſed, and always ſo as to ſignify a "fellow-citizen," or "one upon the ſame "level in ſociety." It appears therefore with the greateſt propriety to be rendered in our Bible by the term "Fellow."

But this term, expreſſive as it is of the real meaning of the original word, and reſpected as it ought to be from its neceſſary reference to the divine nature of our Redeemer, is entirely excluded both in expreſſion and ſubſtance from the new tranſlation, which gives the paſſage thus: "Awake, O ſword, againſt "my ſhepherd, and againſt the man who "is near unto me, ſaith Jehovah *God* of "Hoſts."

Now though the word לעמת, which from its common acceptation may be conſidered as a prepoſition, ſignifies "juxta" or "proxime "ad;"

" ad;" and though עמית ſhould be rendered from thence " proximus;" [w] " non eſt," as we may infer with different commentators from the uſe of this noun itſelf, " proprie quivis " proximus, ſed intime familiaris, nobis con- " junctus quodam jure." For unqueſtionably, as we find our noun itſelf very frequently uſed in Leviticus, we ought to determine its meaning from thence, and not from any paſſage or paſſages in which the prepoſition only is concerned. In Leviticus the meaning of the noun is obvious: [x] " Thou ſhalt not hate thy " brother in thy heart; thou ſhalt in any " wiſe rebuke" את עמיתך " thy neighbour:" " And if thou ſell ought" [y] לעמיתך " to thy " neighbour, or buyeſt ought" מיד עמיתך, " of thy neighbour's hand, ye ſhall not op- " preſs one another;" or, as the original words ſignify, " every man his brother." " Ye " ſhall not ſteal, neither deal falſely, neither " lie" [z] איש בעמיתו " one to another: Ye " ſhall not oppreſs" [a] איש את עמיתו, " one " another." In theſe paſſages, and indeed in " all the others in which the noun is uſed, its

[w] See Poole's Synopſis in loc.
[x] Lev. xix. 17.
[y] Ibid. xxv. 14.
[z] Ibid. xix. 11.
[a] Ibid. xxv. 17.

meaning

meaning is obviouſly ſuch, as to juſtify the explanation which I have above given of it; and alſo to confirm the derivation aſſigned to it by Schultens from an Arabic word, which ſignifies [b] "glomerare, ſeu potius filum filo "ſimili intorquere;" "unde" (as Simonis remarks) "ad ſimilitudinem et interiorem pro- "portionem metaphora facta, quemadmodum "συγκλωσον proprie glomeratum apud Græcos "transfertur ad ſimilia et æqualia, quæ ejuſ- "dem ſunt generis et naturæ.

The Septuagint-Tranſlators, from the ſame want perhaps of [c] proper conception concerning the different Perſons in the Godhead, which has before been attributed to the Chaldee Paraphraſt, have indeed rendered the term in queſtion "πολιτην," or "Citizen." And from thence others may have been induced to lower down its meaning; yet even the

[b] See the word עמית in Simonis's Hebrew Lexicon.

[c] In the Preface to King James's Bible, errors are aſcribed to the Seventy, and ſome to their ignorance: "They (the Se- "venty) did many things well; but yet, as men they ſtum- "bled and fell; one while through overſight, another while "through ignorance; yea, ſometimes they may be noted to "add to the original, and ſometimes to take from it; which "made the Apoſtles to leave them many times when they left "the Hebrew, and to deliver the ſenſe thereof according to "the truth of the word, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Fol. p. 3.

Chaldee

Chaldee Paraphraſt has it "Socium ejus qui "eſt ſimilis ei;" and the Arabic Tranſlator, aware that a connection of intimacy and equality was intended, though tranſlating from the Septuagint, expreſſes it "Fellow-Citizen:" Aquila alſo renders it from the original "Συμ- "φυλετην," "One of the ſame tribe or ward;" and the Vulgate "Cohærentem mihi;" which Jerome explains by referring to our Saviour's declaration, "Ego in Patre et Pater in me;" [d] others by ſaying that it is to be underſtood "Conſubſtantialiter ſecundum divinam natu- "ram, et hypoſtatice ſecundum humanam," and again, [e] others by making it ſignify not only "Conjunctum," but alſo "Coæqualem "quatenus Deus eſt."

I need not inſiſt that the word "near" in the new tranſlation conveys not the moſt diſtant idea of equality between the ſpeaker and the perſon of whom he was ſpeaking: and ſhall only add, that, though the new tranſlation thus degrades, and, if I may ſo ſay, entirely annihilates the awful ſenſe ſo juſtly aſcribed to the term "עמיתי," we have, in the appendix ſubjoined to it, Archbiſhop Sec-

[d] See Poole's Synopſis.
[e] See Menochius's Comment.

ker's interpretation of the term, who ſays expreſsly, that "it ſeems to mean, a perſon "ſtanding upon the ſame level in ſociety."

The third and laſt paſſage, to which I ſhall appeal in ſupport of the doctrine aſcribed to the text, and of which I am alſo to vindicate the Bible-Tranſlation, is found in the 10th verſe of the 12th chapter of Zechariah: "And "I will pour out upon the houſe of David "and upon the inhabitants of Jeruſalem the "ſpirit of grace and ſupplications, and they "ſhall look upon me whom they have "pierced."

That the ſpeaker here is Jehovah is evident, becauſe he is the ſpeaker through the whole of the chapter, and becauſe no other could pour upon man the ſpirit of grace and ſupplications. The only queſtion then is, whether the paſſage be genuine, as it ſtands in the copy from which our Bible is tranſlated, and it ought to be rendered, "look "upon me;" or we are to give up at once all poſſibility of drawing any argument from it in ſupport of our bleſſed Saviour's divinity, and render it, with the new tranſlation, "look "upon him."

The Hebrew copy, from which our Bible-Tranſlation is made, reſts in this paſſage upon the

the [f] authority not only of the greateſt part, but alſo of the moſt valuable, of the Hebrew manuſcripts; upon that of all the ancient verſions, including, as far as can be proved by inference, thoſe of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; and upon the united authority even of the moſt [g] virulent enemies of Chriſtianity.

On the contrary, it is urged, that St. John, in his [h] Goſpel and Book of [i] Revelation, has "look upon him;" and that ſome of the Fathers, and many manuſcripts, ſupport the ſame reading.

Now it is the opinion of [k] learned men that the elliptical form of expreſſion, found in the Greek

[f] See De-Roſſi's Variæ Lectiones Vet. Teſt. in loc.

[g] Among other arguments againſt the adoption of the reading, "look upon him," De-Roſſi urges, "Non modo pleri-"que ac meliores codices ab hac corruptione immunes ſunt, "ſed et ex tot ſcriptoribus antichriſtianis, quos legi ac mag-"no numero poſſideo, ne unus quidem eſt, quod ſciam, qui "objicientibus Chriſtianis Zachariæ prophetiam, reſpondeat "Zachariæ textum eſſe אלי, nullus qui vel ſolam opponat vel "memoret, codicum varietatem. אלי aperte et ſine ullo alterius "lectionis indicio legunt præſertim acerrimi Chriſtianorum "hoſtes Lipmannus," &c. &c.

[h] John xix. 37.

[i] Rev. i. 7.

[k] See the latter part of De-Roſſi's Obſervations on Zech. xii. 10.——When Jerome, in his Epiſtle to Pammachius, ſays that St. John cites this paſſage of Zechariah, "juxta Hebrai-"cam veritatem," and afterwards that St. John's and his own tranſlation differ; he probably means that they differ in the

Greek of the paſſage which is urged from St. John's Goſpel, " εις ὁν εξεκεντησαν," leaves ſtrong doubts concerning the antecedent to " ὁν" in the original Hebrew from which it was tranſlated.—And whoever conſiders the words of Zechariah, which are uſed in the paſſage referred to in the Book of Revelation, will ſee at once, that they are not introduced as a citation; and that, adapted as they were to the other parts of the 5th, 6th, and 7th verſes, they could not be ſpoken of Chriſt otherwiſe than in the third Perſon.

Beſides, excluſively of all ſuch conſiderations, it is well known, with reſpect not only to the Evangeliſts, but alſo to the Fathers, that they often cite the general ſenſe of a paſſage without attending to the particular

form of expreſſion only, not in having been made from Hebrew copies, of which one read " look upon him," and the other " upon me;" as Jerome neither mentions this important difference, nor could he have intended to recede himſelf from that " Hebraica veritas" which he admits in St. John's citation.

This alſo appears ſtill more probable from Jerome's Comment on this paſſage.——Having there diſcuſſed the queſtion whether " whom they have pierced," or " whom they have " inſulted," is the proper reading, he ſpeaks of St. John's attention to the Hebrew more fully and pointedly than in his Epiſtle to Pammachius; and, without the moſt diſtant intimation that St. John did not read " me," he himſelf tranſlates *from the Hebrew* " look upon me."

perſon

perſon of whom it is ſpoken, when their argument depends not upon ſuch attention.—Thus the Prophet Malachi ſays, "Behold "I will ſend my meſſenger, and he ſhall "prepare the way before me:" and, though [h] St. Matthew and [i] St. Mark, [k] Tertullian and [l] Chryſoſtom, referring to this paſſage, all uſe the words, "before thee;" yet no one doubts that the original reading is, "before "me." The author of the new tranſlation himſelf appears not to doubt it, however he may endeavour in his obſervations on this paſſage to preclude the [m] inference which ought to be drawn from thence, that our bleſſed Saviour is "Lord of Hoſts."

That different manuſcripts ſhould favour the contrary reading, is an objection which we ſhall not be diſpoſed to receive with alarm, if we either admit with De-Roſſi, that the Jews corrupted the paſſage from attention to the

[h] Matt. xi. 10.

[i] Mark i. 2.

[k] Tertullian ſays, "Ecce ego mitto angelum meum ante fa-"ciem tuam, id eſt Chriſti, qui præparabit viam tuam ante "te." Adv. Jud. p. 194.

[l] Chryſoſtom alſo ſays, ἰδὺ αποϛελλω τον αγγελον μυ προ προσωπυ συ ὸς κατασκευασει την ὁδον συ εμπροσθεν συ. Works, edit. Montfaucon, vol. vii. p. 415.

[m] See on Mal. iii. 1. Allix's "Judgment, &c." p. 303.

analogy of conſtruction; or with others, that this is one of the eighteen paſſages which the Maſſorah in ſeveral places confeſſeth were fraudulently altered by the Scribes; which latter opinion the alteration of a [o] paſſage of ſimilar meaning in the Pſalms tends immediately to confirm; and beſides it is ſtrenuouſly maintained by Biſhop Pearſon, who [p] ſays that it appears from the direct confeſſion of a Jew to Mercerus.

Whoever therefore conſiders the ſatisfactory manner in which the objections to the eſtabliſhed reading may be anſwered, ought not for a moment to ſuffer them to weigh againſt the very ſuperior arguments which may be [q] accumulated in its defence; much leſs ought he to think himſelf juſtifiable in ſubmitting at once to the obliteration of a reading, which has ever been deemed by the moſt learned men, both in [r] ancient and [s] modern times, an irrefragable proof of the divinity

[o] Pſ. xxii. 17.

[p] See Pearſon on the Creed. Fol. p. 201. 5th edit.

[q] See De-Roſſi in loc.

[r] See Theodoret in loc.

[s] See Bp. Pearſon on the Creed, as above, p. 201. Allix ſays, "We cannot have a better proof that the Meſſias ſhould "be Jehovah, than Zech. xii. 10. which the Targum alſo in-"terprets of the Meſſias." "Judgment, &c." p. 284.

of

of our great Redeemer.—So fully may our Bible-Tranſlation be defended in this, no leſs than the two other paſſages of Zechariah, by which I was to ſupport the literal interpretation of the text.

And when, in addition to the arguments which may be urged from human authority and from the parallel paſſage of Iſaiah in favour of this interpretation, we find it confirmed not only by the language of the text itſelf, but alſo by the three diſtinguiſhed paſſages of the ſame Prophecy which I have been citing and vindicating; I truſt I ſhall not ſpeak without the conviction and approbation of my audience, when I aſſert, that the text ought not to be conſtrued in any other, than its obvious and literal ſenſe, and that the ſpeaker in it is at the ſame time both Lord of Hoſts and the Perſon [t] ſent.

No

[t] The ſame words, which are twice uſed in the text concerning the perſon ſent, "and ye" (the Jews) "ſhall," or "thou" (the daughter of Zion) "ſhalt know that the Lord of Hoſts "hath ſent me," are uſed alſo in Zech. iv. 9. and vi. 15. Leſt therefore the uſe of them in theſe other paſſages ſhould be thought capable of being converted into an objection againſt the interpretation here given of the text; it may be proper, before I quit the ſubject, to remark, firſt, that it is by no means certain, either from the context or from the expoſitions of commentators, that they are ſpoken of the Prophet in Zech. iv. 9. and vi. 15; and ſecondly, that if this was certain, it would not

No four paſſages in any one of the inſpired books can more immediately ſupport each other, or more fully evince a plurality of Perſons in the Godhead, than the text and the other three paſſages of Zechariah which I have ſo often brought before you. But though they moſt powerfully ſupport each other, it by no means follows from thence, that they muſt ſtand or fall together in the confirmation which they yield to the great doctrine deduced from them concerning the Perſons of the Godhead. Any one of them might be ſufficient to confirm this doctrine independently of all the others. Such therefore is their importance, even taken ſeparately, that to have reſcued but one of them from inattention or miſinterpretation, would be an ample recompence for any degree of pains and exertion.

It has been remarked, that few things are more evidently injurious to the cauſe of revealed religion, than the weak and unfounded arguments, uſed by many of its injudicious friends with a wiſh to defend or to illuſtrate

not follow from thence that they muſt be ſpoken of him alſo in the text, which begins with an expreſs declaration from the Lord of Hoſts, "that he himſelf was ſent," and, in its progreſs, makes him ſay, under the name of Jehovah, "Lo! I come."

its

its truth. While I admit the juſtice and full force of this remark, the preceding obſervations neceſſarily ſuggeſt and evince, that we may find, in the liberality of modern conceſſion, an oppoſite extreme, not leſs to be dreaded and oppoſed.

I ſpeak not of conceſſions, which proceed from an indifference to all religion, and which often obtrude themſelves upon us; but of thoſe, which we find, and particularly with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity, in the writings of men diſtinguiſhed by their piety and zeal for Chriſtianity; who, becauſe they ſee the imprudence of ſtraining texts of the Old Teſtament to make them bear upon this doctrine, paſs haſtily on to the oppoſite extreme, and employ all their learning and ingenuity to explain away the meaning of others which obviouſly and neceſſarily ſupport it; who not only give up every argument of the kind, which is allowed by the generality of learned Chriſtians to be inconcluſive, but alſo feel no difficulty in expunging from their Bible readings, which a very great majority of the orthodox defenders of our religion have ever thought unanſwerably deciſive in their favour.—To ſay that this has been done in modern times, would be to aſſert merely what

I truſt

I truſt (as far as the preſent attempt was to extend) has already been proved.

But, while I truſt that this has been the caſe, I cannot refrain from inſiſting, that to be forced to bring forward proofs of ſuch a nature, [w] before we can avail ourſelves of thoſe paſſages of Scripture, to which we have been accuſtomed to appeal without reſerve in our Bible-Tranſlation, is to be placed in a very undeſirable ſituation.—But the importance of the paſſages, which I have been vindicating, ought to ſtimulate our exertions; and to ſuperſede, if not to ſuppreſs, every ſuch conſideration.

Great is the conſolation, which believers may derive from theſe paſſages when properly interpreted and enforced. Every where therefore ought they to be held up to view and vindicated. But beſides, in this place, bad conſequences of the moſt extenſive nature muſt ariſe from indifference or ſilence on ſuch occaſions.

In the purſuit of theological knowledge, the young ſtudent, on whom the faith of thouſands may depend, is always directed to apply for inſtruction, concerning difficult or diſ-

[w] When the author appealed to different paſſages of Zechariah, in the two Sermons which he publiſhed on the Trinity, he had not at that time read any part of the new Tranſlation of the Minor Prophets.

puted

puted paſſages of Scripture, to tranſlations and comments. And, ſo prevalent is the averſion to laborious reſearch in the preſent times, it is much to be feared, that the greater part will content themſelves with applying to modern writings of both theſe deſcriptions, rather than ſubmit to the fatigue of following the ancients in their learned and elaborate inveſtigations and diſplays of divine truth.

Among theſe modern productions, "The "attempt towards an improved verſion— "and an explanation of the Twelve Minor "Prophets" will certainly not eſcape their attention.

In ſuch hands therefore, the greater the general excellency of any work, the more reſpectable the character of its author, and the more elevated his rank; the more ſerious and laſting danger is to be apprehended from ſuch miſinterpretations of important parts of Scripture, as have above been ſubjected to your conſideration. For in tranſlations of Scripture the tranſlator does not merely give an opinion, but he decides abſolutely; he alters the text itſelf of holy Writ: and thus, if he decides wrong, he poiſons the ſources of theological information, he digs up the very foundations on which the ſuperſtructure of a ſound and orthodox faith muſt ever be raiſed.

However

However undeſirable therefore it may be to be called upon thus to vindicate our Bible-Tranſlation, the employment itſelf, which is every where an obvious duty, becomes in this place a duty of the moſt extenſive importance.

God grant that the vindication here attempted of the true meaning both of the text, and of the three important paſſages by which it is confirmed, may tend to eſtabliſh and comfort us in the belief of the great myſtery of the Holy Trinity; and may induce us in all our ſcriptural inquiries, firſt, to regard with veneration the excellent tranſlation of the ſacred Scriptures which our Bible exhibits; and then to decide concerning ſuch important paſſages in it, as may be thought capable of an improved expoſition, by the only means of deciſion, which we can with confidence adopt, where modern interpreters, notwithſtanding all their advantages, diſagree, and Scripture admits of different conſtructions, namely, by a laborious and patient examination into the writings of the moſt learned men of antiquity, and into the ſupport which the paſſages in queſtion derive from other and ſimilar parts of holy Writ.

12 MR 58

AS Dr. Blayney, the Regius Profeſſor of Hebrew, has ſubjoined to his new tranſlation of Zechariah an Appendix in reply to the preceding Sermon, it is incumbent upon me to return ſome anſwer, leſt it ſhould be inferred that I have nothing to urge in my own vindication.

I muſt previouſly however remark, that he by no means attempts to defend even the greater part of the poſitions which are controverted in my Sermon; that he gives up thoſe of the Chaldee Paraphraſt and Lowth concerning the text or the firſt of my four paſſages, and thoſe of the Primate concerning the ſecond and fourth; and that I might hold myſelf excuſed from paying attention to the new poſitions, from which he argues againſt my concluſions. But, as I am convinced theſe concluſions are defenſible againſt all the arguments which he advances, and as I intend at preſent never more to reſume the ſubject, I ſhall wave the advantage which I might take, and proceed to conſider the whole of the Appendix.

In oppoſition to the citations which are adduced to ſupport my conſtruction of the text, it is propoſed in the Appendix to ſet wholly aſide the authority of ancient Commentators and Fathers

of

of the early ages. To this I can by no means conſent. Ought we, with reſpect even to any individual among them, to place dependence in no caſe upon his opinion, becauſe we cannot univerſally depend upon it? And can we then, becauſe each individual among them may have erred, think ourſelves juſtifiable "in ſetting wholly aſide their "authority," in a caſe where they all agree in their interpretation, and where they certainly are not chargeable with any of [a] "thoſe groſs miſtakes "and notorious miſtranſlations" for which their authority is to be annihilated? If ſuch concluſions are to be admitted, we ought at once to give up all deference to the judgment of others. For where is the man, whether ancient or modern, how ſuperior ſoever his abilities and how eminent ſoever his learning, who has not erred even groſsly? And, moreover, the ſacred interpreters, to whom I appeal, are not all to be conſidered as ancient Commentators and early Fathers: among them are to be found ſome of the moſt eminent Critics of later ages.

In explaining the words of the text, Dr. B. depends principally upon the obſervations which he introduces concerning the angel by whom they were delivered. This is a ſubject upon which I did not at all enter. Beſides, he by no means correctly ſtates by whom they were actually delivered. What is ſaid in the Appendix to be [b] "as clear as clear can be" appears to me, and muſt appear to every one, who [c] conſiders the ſub-

[a] App. p. 79.
[b] App. p. 80.
[c] See from ver. 3. to the end of Zech. ii.

ject

ject with attention, in a very different light. To me it appears moſt evident, that the actual deliverer of the text, or [d] "the immediate ſpeaker," is not, as Dr. B. contends, "the angel to whom "another angel has given orders;" but an angel who was acting in a much higher capacity; he is the perſon who is called "another angel," and was himſelf giving orders to the angel who talked with Zechariah.

The truth is, in the delivery of the text to the Jews three perſons were to be concerned; the angel who firſt communicated it; an angel who received it from him; and Zechariah to whom this latter angel before talked, and to whom he was to convey the information he received.

The Chaldee Paraphraſt and Lowth, againſt whom my obſervations were directed, conſider the laſt, or the Prophet, as the perſon who delivers the text; Dr. B. aſcribes the delivery to the ſecond; but the actual deliverer of it, or the immediate ſpeaker, is the firſt. To determine this matter requires little or no exertion. The only real difficulty diſcovers itſelf when we attempt to aſcertain who this firſt perſon is.

Poſſibly we may not be ſupplied with information ſufficient to enable us at preſent fully to ſolve this difficulty. It is certain however that the ſecond chapter of Zechariah, from which the text is taken, is connected with the firſt; as it opens with the introduction of a man with the line in his hand to meaſure Jeruſalem, which it was before [e] expreſsly ſaid ſhould be ſtretched forth upon it. And it is no leſs certain alſo, that in the firſt chap-

[d] App. p. 80. [e] Zech. i. 16.

ter a great perſon, who is [f] called Jehovah and the Lord of Hoſts, not only employs, in the conveyance of information to the Prophet, the ſame angel that is uſed for this purpoſe by the immediate ſpeaker in the text; but alſo the information itſelf is exactly of the [g] ſame kind, with reſpect both to the denunciation of God's diſpleaſure againſt the enemies of Jeruſalem, and to the future proſperity of Zion. The only difference in the conveyance of this information from them is, that in the firſt chapter Jehovah is merely ſaid to have communicated [h] "good words and comfortable words," leaving it to the angel to give them at full length to the Prophet; whereas, in the ſecond, the perſon, who is called "another angel," himſelf delivers at full [i] length the information, which he orders the angel who talked with the Prophet to convey to him. Beſides, theſe circumſtances are the more worthy of our notice, ſince even Lowth himſelf [k] inſiſts that Jehovah, or the Lord of Hoſts, who is deſcribed as acting in this manner, was before called in the firſt chapter "an angel."

But ſtill, whatever conjectures we may draw from hence, I preſume not to infer that the immediate ſpeaker in the text muſt neceſſarily be the ſame angel. This however by no means precludes

[f] Ver. 12, 13.

[g] Compare Zech. i. 15—17. with Zech. ii. 8—11.

[h] Ver. 13.

[i] See from ver. 3, to the end of the chapter.

[k] Lowth ſays, on ver. 12. "The angel, mentioned ver. 9, "makes his ſupplication to the ſuperior angel, ver. 8, 10.; "who was indeed the Logos or Son of God, being called by "the name of Jehovah here," &c.

me

me from perſiſting to aſſert with confidence, both that he was giving orders to the angel who talked with the Prophet, and that he directed this angel to deliver the whole of the text, agreeably to the opinion maintained by the great Theologians of former ages, in the words of the Lord of Hoſts, as *ſent* by the Father; or, to uſe the name which Lowth himſelf ſays was applied to him in the preceding chapter, as his *angel.*

Dr. B. indeed aſſerts, that the angel who delivers the text repeats it partly in his own words, and partly in the words of the Lord of Hoſts. But his [1] diſtribution of it between them is ſanctioned by no authority; and the interpretation of the original language, by which it is ſupported, appears

[1] Zech. ii. 8—11. is thus tranſlated by Dr. B.

8. For thus hath Jehovah of Hoſts ſaid
Sending me after the glory
Unto the nations that ſpoiled you,
" Surely he that touched you hath touched the apple of
" his eye."
9. For behold I am about to wave my hand over them,
And they ſhall be a ſpoil to their ſervants.
And ye ſhall know that Jehovah of Hoſts hath ſent me.
10. Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Sion,
For, " Behold I am coming,
" And I will dwell in the midſt of thee, ſaith Jehovah.
11. " And many nations ſhall be joined
" Unto Jehovah in that day,
" And ſhall become a people unto me;
" And I will dwell in the midſt of thee."
Then ſhalt thou know that Jehovah of Hoſts hath ſent me
unto thee.

How far this tranſlation, and the appropriation of its different parts to the different ſpeakers, who are diſtinguiſhed by the inverted commas, appear to be natural, every reader muſt determine for himſelf.

(as far as I can judge) to be itſelf by no means well-founded. For (not to dwell upon the new conſtruction, by which, in total oppoſition to the points, שלחני is rendered "ſending me") there appears to be no reaſon why כי, which is rendered "For" at the beginning of the text, ſhould be made to ſignify "Surely" immediately afterwards; or why ו ſhould be rendered at the concluſion "Then," and not, as before, ſimply "And." Doubtleſs it muſt be allowed, that preceding tranſlators knew all the ſignifications of theſe particles, on which ſo much is now made to depend: and yet no tranſlator, even if we include the learned Primate himſelf, has ever before aſſigned to them in this paſſage the different ſenſes, in which Dr. B. here uſes them.

I am alſo not in the leaſt diſpoſed to ſubſcribe to the inference, which we are left to draw from the ſentence which cloſes in the Appendix the obſervations upon Zech. ii. 8—11. "There is indeed "good reaſon to believe that no part of the reve- "lation of the Old Teſtament was delivered "through the immediate miniſtry of the Son of "God, ſince that is cited as the diſtinguiſhing "characteriſtic of the Goſpel diſpenſation. Heb. i. "1, 2."—In theſe two firſt verſes of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews the author ſpeaks of the immediate communication of the will of God to the Jews through the Prophets, and to Chriſtians through his Son: he by no means ſays, or inſinuates, either that God did not employ his Son to make known his will to the Prophets before they communicated it to the Jews, or that the Son was not actually ſent to the Prophets and others, both to declare and to execute his Father's will. Biſhop Bull very fully

fully aſſerts, [m] " Ubicunque non merum angelum, " ſed ipſum Deum apparuiſſe liquet, ibi non Pa- " trem ſed Filium intelligendum eſſe primævæ " antiquitatis conſentiens judicium religioſe ſe- " quentes conſtanter affirmamus."

As to Zech. iii. 2. which is the ſecond paſſage I attempt to vindicate, or the firſt of thoſe which I uſe to confirm my explanation of the text; the two ſuppoſitions, as Dr. B. calls them, which he [n] ſays " appear but very problematical even at " the beſt," and " loſe even the ſhadow of pro- " bability when we render יגער in the future," muſt have been aſſumed as " evident and un- " queſtionable" by the learned Primate, on whoſe tranſlation my obſervations were made; otherwiſe he could not poſſibly have introduced " the angel " of" before Jehovah: nor can I at preſent ſee any reaſon for rejecting them. I have [o] already ſpoken concerning the repetition of the word Jehovah, Zech. ii. 11.

Little or nothing is ſaid in the Appendix concerning the third paſſage by way of reply to the authorities, upon which I have aſſigned a meaning to the noun עמיתי different from what belongs to the prepoſition לעמת, upon a ſuppoſition that both might have the ſame origin. It is therefore hardly neceſſary for me to add, in vindication of this difference of meaning, that the two words are not even derived from the ſame root by Simonis in his new and very valuable Hebrew Lexicon. — To preclude the inference which is drawn from Zech. xiii. 7. in ſupport of our Saviour's equality with

[m] Bulli Fid. Nic. Def. Sect. 4. c. 3. § 16.
[n] App. p. 81.
[o] See note p. 11.

the Father, Dr. B. declares, [p] "he is fully per-
"ſuaded the Redeemer is not meant, and his ſuf-
"ferings not ſpoken of in this place."—The con-
trary opinion is founded, not on any diſtant allu-
ſion to this Prophecy by St. Matthew, but on a
direct [q] application of it by our Saviour himſelf,
through the cauſal particle "For," to his own ſuf-
ferings. If this is not to be numbered among the
paſſages, of which our Saviour is made to ſay by
another Evangeliſt, [r] "all things muſt be ful-
"filled which were written in the law of Moſes,
"and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms con-
"cerning me," how can we ever aſcertain what
thoſe paſſages are?

The ground upon which the Bible-Tranſlation of
the laſt paſſage, or Zech. xii. 10. muſt now be de-
fended is totally changed. Dr. B. confeſſes, [s] "Were
"the matter to be decided by the number and
"weight of authorities, I am of opinion with De-
"Roſſi, that the ſcale would turn in favour of

[p] App. p. 82.

[q] Compare Zech. xiii. 7. with Matt. xxvi. 31.
In his Notes on Zech. xiii. 7. p. 68, Dr. B. ſays that our Savi-
"our refers to this paſſage, as to a proverbial ſaying (juſt as we
"might do, if we had met with one to our purpoſe in any pro-
"fane author) laying it down as a matter of courſe, for *the*
"*followers to diſperſe when their leader was taken off.*" A dif-
ferent explanation of our Saviour's reference might perhaps
have been expected after the very juſt remark which we find
in Dr. B.'s Preliminary Diſcourſe: "It muſt be acknowledged,
"that, next to Iſaiah, Zechariah is the moſt evangelical of
"all the Prophets, having more frequent and more clear and
"direct alluſions to the character and coming of the Meſſiah,
"and his kingdom, than any of the reſt." p. 15.

[r] Luke xxiv. 44.

[s] Notes, p. 63.

"אלי."

" אלי ;" or againſt אליו. But, I doubt not, Dr. B.'s new poſt will be found in the end as untenable, as that which the learned Primate occupied.

Deſirous to reconcile אלי to St. John's citation, De-Roſſi conjectures, with Caluſius, that poſſibly St. John might cite from a manuſcript, which omitted the [t] את, and read אלי pointed like the ſimple prepoſition, and thus that he might render אלי אשר " ad quem." Dr. B. goes farther, and ſuppoſes not only that אלי, admitting an alteration in the punctuation, is a ſimple prepoſition, but alſo that it is uſed as ſuch in this paſſage before את אשר. Accordingly he renders theſe words אלי את אשר " εις ὁν," and the whole clauſe, nearly as the Primate has it, " They ſhall look towards him " whom they pierced."

I ſhall ſay nothing of the reaſons which Caluſius and De-Roſſi had for omitting [u] את before they offered any conjecture concerning the conſtruction of אלי by St. John: neither ſhall I enquire whether they thought the Evangeliſt, whom they ſuppoſe to be ſo far left to himſelf as to uſe a corrupted copy with reſpect to the omiſſion of את, ought not to have conſidered the alteration preſumed in the punctuation of אלי as erroneous, rather than the word itſelf as a ſimple prepoſition; becauſe the argument, which I have to urge on the ſubject, will I think effectually ſet aſide their

[t] The Hebrew words, which we render, " and they ſhall " look upon me whom they have pierced," diveſted of their points, are והביטו אלי את אשר דקרו.

[u] In Dr. B.'s Notes (p. 64.) את is firſt ſaid to be " ſimply " the ſign of the accuſative caſe," and afterwards it is claſſed among the prepoſitions: but no proof is brought that אל, and much leſs that אלי, is ever uſed as a prepoſition before it.

opinion (if it were theirs) and alſo Dr. B.'s, that אלי, even if we pay no attention whatſoever to the points, might itſelf have probably been uſed by Zechariah in this paſſage as a ſimple prepoſition. It certainly is ſometimes uſed in this manner in the Book of Job: but it is well known that many words are found in that book, which are not to be found in any other part of the Old Teſtament; and [w] this perhaps is one of them.

I do not preſume to aſſert abſolutely that אלי is not ſo uſed in any other part of the Old Teſtament: for what information can carry our knowledge of the uſe of a prepoſition to ſuch an extent? As far as my own obſervation goes, and as far as I can infer from the citations which are found in ſome of the beſt Lexicons and Concordances, this uſe of it is confined to the Book of Job.

But I will aſſert abſolutely, that it is not ſo uſed in any paſſage of Zechariah. Nor let this be thought to ariſe from hence, that Zechariah ſeldom introduces the ſimple prepoſition, and ſeldom the word which is compounded of that prepoſition and י the pronominal affix. אל is uſed by him 39 times; and אלי not leſs than 23. אל is uniformly and ſimply rendered "to:" and, in 22 out of the 23 times, אלי is rendered by Dr. B. himſelf "to me." The queſtion then is, how ought it to be rendered in the remaining place, or Zech. xii. 10? There appears not the [x] ſhadow of a rea-

[w] Be it remembered that I am now ſpeaking of אלי unconnected with any affix.

[x] The only three paſſages, in which I find אלי uſed (as it is here) before את, are Deut. ix. 10. Joſ. x. 22. and 1 Chron. xiii. 12. in all of which it is tranſlated "to me."

ſon,

ſon, why it ſhould not be rendered here, as it is every where elſe in Zechariah. They, who render it differently, muſt at leaſt contend (even if no argument be urged againſt them from other books of the Old Teſtament) that אלי, diveſted of points, is uſed here in a manner, in which Zechariah does not uſe it in any other part of his writings.—Both the Septuagint-interpretation before the introduction of the points, and the points themſelves which were afterwards annexed, demonſtrate, that from the beginning the Jews were convinced it ought in this place to be rendered "to me." Indeed the Jews appear at all times to have been borne down, and ſilenced, by the irreſiſtible force of this conviction. Whatever other attempts they may have made to get rid, either of the change of perſon in the words "look upon me" and (thoſe which follow) "mourn for him," or of the arguments preſſed upon them by Chriſtians, in conſequence of אלי being here tranſlated "to me," they have never once ventured to propoſe a different tranſlation.

When Dr. B. brings forward the reaſon which I aſſign why the Evangeliſts and Fathers may be ſuppoſed not to cite this paſſage with exactneſs, "becauſe they often cite the general ſenſe of a "paſſage without attending to the perſon of "whom it is ſpoken when their argument de-"pends not upon ſuch attention;" and adds, [y] "but here if ever the argument does depend "upon ſuch attention;" he appears to have entirely miſunderſtood my meaning, as the argu-

[y] App. p. 83.

ment,

ment, to which alone I can admit that St. John [z] attended, is not directed to prove that Chriſt is God, but only that he was pierced. That the difference between St. John's citation and the Bible-Tranſlation may be thus accounted for, and that this method of accounting for it may alſo be ſupported by the examples which I adduce from two other Evangeliſts, I ſtill contend.

The change of perſon in our tranſlation of Zech. xii. 10. was alluded to, when [a] I ſaid De-Roſſi ſuppoſed the Jews to have corrupted the paſſage "from attention to the analogy of conſtruction:" and I ſhould have ſaid more on the ſubject, had the learned Primate, whoſe tranſlation I was conſidering, mentioned it, even in the ſlighteſt manner, as a reaſon for the alteration which he introduced.—Somewhat might be taken from the harſhneſs with which it ſtrikes the ear, were the verſe, or even the ſentence to conclude in the Hebrew with דקרו, and in our tranſlation with the words "whom they have pierced." Such a concluſion appears to be adviſable, if not neceſſary; becauſe a different part of the ſame great ſubject is introduced in the words which immediately follow, namely, "the mourning for the "Meſſiah;" which is purſued through all the ſubſequent verſes, nor is even an alluſion to his piercing afterwards found in the chapter.—But this change of perſon, however harſh it may ſound, was known to the Jews; and the very harſhneſs of it not only proves, that they were convinced the preſent Hebrew text could not be rendered otherwiſe than we have it in our Bible; but alſo that from

[z] John xix. 37. [a] Serm. p. 21, 22.

the

the beginning they actually found אלי and not אליו in their copies; for doubtleſs they would not deſignedly have introduced a new reading, which muſt deſtroy the uniformity of ſo important a paſſage in their Scriptures. It was known alſo to all the great divines of our Church, and did not alter their opinion concerning the Hebrew text, or our tranſlation of it. And does not Dr. B. himſelf, without the ſanction of any authority, introduce in his explanation of Zech. ii. 8—11. an interchange of ſpeakers, at leaſt as undeſirable in a controverted paſſage of Scripture, as the change of perſon which is here defended by ſo many men of learning?

With regret I muſt remark, before I conclude, that it is evident from the latter part, and indeed from the whole, of the Appendix, that I have given conſiderable offence. Nothing could be farther from my intention, both in the obſervations which I made on the Septuagint-Verſion of Jer. xxiii. 6. and in thoſe which are again ſubmitted to the public in the preceding Sermon, than to impute improper motives to the reſpectable and learned Tranſlators from whom I differ in opinion. While I was anxious in the firſt place to do juſtice to my ſubject, I certainly endeavoured to do the ſame to the character of my opponents. This I know, and can aſſert with confidence; and for this I truſt, whatever may be the caſe at preſent, that credit will in the end univerſally be given to me.

Lately published by the same Author,

A SECOND EDITION

Of his BAMPTON-LECTURE, and other, SERMONS.

12 MR 58

4224.cc.6